REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended better to point out that which applicants regard as their invention; claim 1 contains, among other things, the limitations of now-canceled claim 2. Claim 5 has been amended to address the rejection of that claim under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112. Claim 5 now depends from claim 4 providing antecedent basis for "the groove" and the phrase "the ring connecting section" in line 4 has been changed to read "a ring connecting section." Changes have been made also in claims 3, 6, and 14. A new claim 34 has been added. The claims before the Examiner for consideration are claims 1, 3 to 17, and 34.

The finality of the restriction requirement is acknowledged. The non-elected claims have been canceled to advance prosecution and applicants will rely upon the protections afforded by 35 USC 119 regarding any divisional application that may be filed.

New claim 34 is directed to a preferred embodiment of the invention is also added. See Fig.7b.

The indication that claim 17 contains allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. However, for the reasons

given below, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable.

The rejection of claims 2 and 5 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 are believed overcome by the changes to claims 1 and 5. The relationship involving the center line angle sums is recited in more detail in claim 1. The antecedent basis concern regarding claim 5 is believed to have been overcome. If, after reviewing the present changes, the Examiner believes that the other words or phrases are more appropriate, he is asked to contact the undersigned.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, and 5 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Soto et al. '437, if applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 now contains the limitations of claim 2, a claim not rejected under 35 USC 102. The rejection should be withdrawn. It is noted that the Examiner also discusses each of claims 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12 in the section of the Office Action dealing with the 35 USC 102 rejection, even though those claims are not expressly indicated to have been rejected. These claims, because they depend from claim 1, are not anticipated by the reference.

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 8, and 13 to 16 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Soto et al. '437 is respectfully traversed. As indicated above, claim 2 is now incorporated

into claim 1. The Examiner has asserted that specific terminal orientation "would have been an obvious design consideration based on the specific application and mounting technique used"; see the first paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claims patentably define over the reference.

Claim 1 now states that the plurality of ring sections are disposed in a plane and are connected to each other through ring connecting sections to be disposed in a triangle shape wherein a sum of an angle formed by center lines each connecting centers of the ring sections adjacent to each other, and an angle formed by the center line and an extension line extending from the center of the ring center toward the end section of the ring section is approximately 180°, the end section being connected to the terminal.

A coil component having the configuration indicated above means that when the ring sections (32) are folded on top of one another (see Fig. 2), the terminals (35) are lined linearly at opposite sides with respect to the center line of the coil section (34) and the coil connecting sections (31) are positioned at an angle of 45° with respect to the center line extending through the terminals (35). The structure permits the coil connecting sections (31) to be positioned at

corners of a cubic package (36) when accommodated therein; see Fig. 13b. Accordingly, one is able to achieve coil component miniaturization.

In the present invention ring sections (31) would not overlap with the terminals even if the coil connecting sections are longer but making them longer would detract from being able to miniaturize. The present invention has been able to overcome such a contradiction. Instant Fig. 2 shows that the coil connecting sections (31) of the folded coil section (34) are positioned 90° apart from each other so that the coil connecting sections (31) do not overlap and are not subject to being shorted out even without insulation. As such, the coil component is more reliable than prior art coil components. See Figs. 12c and 13b.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Soto et al. '473 discloses loops 18, 20, 22, and 24 arranged respectively to position in four directions in a square shape; see Fig. 1. First and second terminal ends 14 and 16, respectively, are brought to the same side and connecting portions 26, 28, 32, and 34 are overlapped on top of one another. See Fig. 3. Accordingly, Soto et al. '473 differs from the present invention in configuration, making it difficult to miniaturize the reference product, which also requires insulating the

connecting portions 26, 28, 32, and 34 absolutely, all of which can lower the product reliability. The configuration claimed by applicants patentably defines over the reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Soto et al. '437 in view of Yerman et al. '902 is also respectfully traversed. Claim 10 depends from clam 1 and is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable. Moreover, claim 10 does not recite that the coil connecting portion 31 is provided with any insulating film layer (claim 10 specifies that "the ring section excluding the ring connecting section is provided with an insulating coating layer" (emphasis added)) and the claim as well as all the other claims patentably defines over the prior art. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents and for listing references submitted with a Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Charles A. Wendel

Registration No. 24,453

CAW/ch

Atty Docket: 28951.5295

(YMOR:295)

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 429-6415